



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Eoh
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,692	11/25/2003	Kenichi Murakami	108421-00084	3043
4372	7590	11/25/2005		EXAMINER
AREN'T FOX PLLC 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				DOTY, HEATHER ANNE
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2813	

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,692	MURAKAMI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Heather A. Doty	2813	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 7 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

Applicant's amendment to the specification has overcome the objections made in the previous Office action to the drawings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Applicant's amendment to claim 4 has overcome the rejection made in the previous Office action under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibuya et al. (JP 11-297579, published 10/29/1999).

Regarding claim 1, Shibuya et al. teaches a process for producing an electrode for an electric double layer capacitor, the process comprising joining an electrode-forming sheet including activated carbon (abstract), conductive carbon (carbon black—paragraph 0002, abstract), and binder (polytetrafluoroethylene—paragraph 0004, abstract) and a collector sheet having a conductive adhesive on its surface (abstract); and containing alcohol-based solvent in the electrode-forming sheet while joining the collector sheet and the electrode-forming sheet (the abstract discloses forming the

electrode-forming sheet with ethanol, affixing the electrode-forming sheet to the collector with an adhesive, and then drying).

Shibuya et al. does not teach that the electrode-forming sheet contains an alcohol-based solvent having 2 to 10% or 3 to 6%—further limited by claim 7— by weight of the electrode-forming sheet. However, it has been held that “where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” *In re Aller* 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 2, Shibuya et al. teaches the process for producing an electrode for an electric double-layer capacitor according to claim 1, and further teaches that the alcohol-based solvent (ethanol) is a forming aid agent used during a kneading process of the activated carbon, the conductive carbon, and the binder (abstract).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 3, 5, and 6 are discussed in the Office action dated 6/9/2005. Regarding claim 4, prior art does not teach or suggest, in combination with the other claimed limitations, adding additional alcohol-based solvent to the electrode-forming sheet after the rolling process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Additionally, Applicant argues on page 8 of the arguments dated 9/8/2005 that "the presently claimed invention comprises adding alcohol based solvent to the raw materials, kneading the raw materials, pulverizing the kneading material, forming the material in sheet, rolling the sheet to have predetermined thickness, and then, additionally adding the alcohol based solvent while joining the collector sheet and the electrode forming sheet."

Examiner points out that claim 1 does *not* contain the limitation that additional alcohol is added while joining the collector sheet and the electrode-forming sheet. Claim 4, as amended, is the only claim that includes the limitation of additionally adding an alcohol-based solvent after the rolling process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather A. Doty, whose telephone number is 571-272-8429. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached at 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2813

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

had


DAVID BLUM
PRIMARY EXAMINER